

**Amendments to the drawings:**

Attached hereto is a replacement sheet containing Figs. 3 and 4. In this replacement sheet, Fig. 4 has been amended to add legends to the boxes.

## REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated December 6, 2005, which set a three-month period for response. Filed herewith is a Request for a One-month Extension of Time, making this amendment due by April 6, 2006.

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the specification, drawings, and claim 1 were objected to for various informalities. Claims 1, 3, 6, and 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,814,053 to Hawkins et al. Claims 2 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,760,681 to Takahashi.

The Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claims 4 and 5 if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In the present amendment, the specification has been amended to add standard sectional headings.

Fig. 4 has been amended to add labels to the boxes, as requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to correct the noted typographical error ("method *for* diagnosis") and to adopt standard method claim format. Claims 2-12 were amended as necessary also to adopt standard claim format.

With regard to the substantive rejection of claims 1-3 and 6-12, the Applicants respectfully disagree that the cited patent to Hawkins discloses all of

the features of independent claim 1. Hawkins does not relate to the diagnosis of a sensor, rather only to monitoring the speed of an internal combustion engine. As can be seen in Hawkins' Fig. 3, the engine speed is compared with threshold values. However, Hawkins does not disclose or suggest that either the undershooting or exceeding of the threshold value is used for diagnosis of the sensor.

Because claim 1 does define this feature, the rejection of claim 1 over the Hawkins reference must be withdrawn. For a prior art reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claim with sufficient clarity to prove its existence in the prior art. ***Motorola, Inc. v. Interdigital Tech. Corp.***, 43 USPQ 2d 1481, 1490 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3 and 6-12 also are patentable over the cited art. The Applicants further request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 and reconsideration of the claims as herein amended. The Applicants respectfully submit that this application stands in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'W' followed by a long horizontal stroke.

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No.: 27233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631-549-4700